

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 27, 2007. Claims 1-26 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-26 were rejected. Claims 1-26 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The specification was objected to for informalities. The Examiner suggested that Applicant provides the serial numbers of all co-pending applications mentioned on page 1 of the specification. Applicant has so amended the indicated portion of the specification to include such serial numbers. The Examiner also objected to the title of the Application as not descriptive. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The claims of the present Application are directed toward a system and method for accessing, transmitting and receiving audio/video (A/V) program data using various components (e.g., a source component, a sink component, a presentation device, etc.). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the title "Audio/Video Component Networking System and Method" is descriptive of the subject matter of the present Application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the specification objections be withdrawn.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2002/0056118 issued to Hunter (hereinafter "*Hunter*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 13 and 22 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that *Hunter* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of independent Claims 1, 13 and 22. *Hunter* appears to disclose a video and music distribution system where audio and video content is delivered by blanket transmission to households utilizing a direct broadcast satellite transmission and corresponding receiving antenna dishes 24. (*Hunter*, paragraph [0051], figure 1). *Hunter* also appears to disclose that consumer user stations 228 receive the downlink transmissions of audio and video content via the home user's satellite dish

24. (*Hunter*, paragraph [0128], figure 11). *Hunter* also appears to indicate that the audio and video content is received by a download module 220 of the user station 228 where it is stored digitally in a storage module 230, which *Hunter* describes as "a large hard disk drive having a storage capacity of 20 gigabytes, or more." (*Hunter*, paragraph [0128], figure 11).

Claim 1 recites a "sink component adapted to control presentation of A/V program data received from [a] source component on [a] presentation device." In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to refer to either reference number 228 or 610 of *Hunter* as corresponding to the "sink component" recited by Claim 1. (Office Action, pages 2 and 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to the storage module 230 (which is part of the user station 228) of *Hunter* as the "source component" recited by Claim 1. (Office Action, page 2). Therefore, the user station 228/storage module 230 of *Hunter* cannot be construed to be both the "source component" and the "sink component" recited by Claim 1 as this would be an improper claim construction.

Nonetheless, neither the user station 228 nor the "'companion' set-top box 610" of *Hunter* is adapted to "transmit a command to the source component to control display of an A/V menu data stream on the presentation device" as recited by Claim 1. (emphasis added). For example, the user station 228 of *Hunter* appears to contain a viewer interface/interactive program guide that enables a user to determine what movies have been recorded onto the user station 228 and/or what movies may be available to view. (*Hunter*, paragraphs [0074]-[0076]). However, the user station 228 of *Hunter* does not appear to provide any "A/V menu data stream" as recited by Claim 1 (e.g., "a continuous or periodic data flow, predetermined or otherwise, such that the A/V menu data flow may comprise a series of content-filled frames, periodic content-filled frames interlaced with null bit frames and/or a non-constant frame rate flow where a new data frame is sent in response to a change or update to the data, thereby enabling automatic updating of A/V menu data provided to the user via sink component 12" (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0021])). (emphasis added). Further, the companion box 610 of *Hunter* appears to receive content from either the user station 228 or directly from a satellite dish and is configured to display menus and choices to a customer to facilitate selection of material to be recorded or displayed. (*Hunter*, paragraphs [0150] and [0151]). However, the companion box 610 of *Hunter* does not appear to provide any "A/V menu data stream" as

recited by Claim 1. (emphasis added). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason also, *Hunter* does not anticipate Claim 1.

Independent Claim 13 recites "controlling, via a command issued by the sink component to the source component, presentation of an A/V menu data stream on the presentation device." (emphasis added). Independent Claim 22 recites "means for controlling, via a command issued by the sink component to the source component, presentation of an A/V menu data stream received from the source component on the presentation device." (emphasis added). At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that *Hunter* also does not anticipate Claims 13 and 22.


Claims 2-12, 14-21 and 23-26 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 13 and 22 are also not anticipated by *Hunter* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 13 and 22 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Hunter*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-26 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: June 27, 2007

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-7244